



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Advocate of Peace.

VOL. LXV.

BOSTON, MAY, 1903.

No. 5

THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY,

PUBLISHERS,

31 BEACON STREET, BOSTON, MASS.

MONTHLY, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR.

TEN CENTS PER COPY.

Entered at the Boston Post Office as Second Class Matter.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITORIALS	77-81
International Honesty and Honor—The Reconstruction of Patriotism—Hobsonism—The Women's Universal Peace Demonstration—The Seventy-fifth Annual Meeting of the American Peace Society.	
EDITORIAL NOTES.....	81-84
The Stated Congress—Parliamentary Arbitration Group—Real Horror of War—Symbols of War—War and Crime—War Pictures Removed—Peace the Path of Peace—Franklin's Opinion—Under Cover of the Bible—Sum of the Patriot's Duty.	
BREVITIES	84-86
GENERAL ARTICLES:	
Where Will the War be Next? <i>Poem, Edwin L. Sabin.</i>	86
An Effective Diplomatic Service as an Agency for the Promotion of International Peace. <i>George F. Seward.</i>	86-88
A Memorial Day Message of Peace. <i>Rev. J. W. Kliever.</i>	88-91
How War Demoralizes Men. <i>Hon. William Everett.</i>	91-92
NEW BOOKS	92-93

International Honesty and Honor.

We were moved to write all sorts of severe things when the despatch came from Peking, apparently authoritative, that Russia had made demands on China in regard to the control of Manchuria that involved violation of all her pledges to China and the powers. We felt, however, the exceeding improbability of the truth of the report, and concluded to wait.

If the report had been true in its more serious features, Russia would have been guilty before the world of the most shameless lying and deception, and would have deserved the excoriation which she has received in many quarters since the report. It has been generally believed that all her promises to evacuate Manchuria have been mere ruses, and that not one of them had any sincerity in it. This has not been our view.

One cannot believe anything of a nation worse than that she is guilty of deliberate, studied falsehood for selfish ends. Diplomatic lying is as base as individual lying, and much less excusable. There is nothing more dishonorable to a nation and ultimately more degrading and ruinous. England's frightful lying about the Boer people would scarcely have been possible had she not trained herself in the art for many years previously, especially in the matter of

her promise to evacuate Egypt. Whatever gain may have come to Egypt by her control has been more than lost to England herself and to civilization by the degradation of character that has befallen her from the persistent falsehood which she has been enacting. There is one very praiseworthy thing to be said of American diplomatic dealing with other countries: whatever criticism of it may be made in other ways, it has always been truthful and straightforward.

If Russia had proceeded, or moved to proceed, toward China and the powers as this report from Peking indicated, she would thereby in the present juncture of her foreign relations have immeasurably dishonored herself and undone practically all the good accomplished by her two great recent moves for the promotion of a higher civilization. The dishonor would have been all the greater because of the Hague Conference and the recent proclamation of religious liberty throughout the empire.

Is it possible that she was blind to all these considerations? That she had no diplomatic self-respect? That she would boldly have thrown to the winds all her pledges to China and the United States? That she would have flung herself into the certain danger of war with England and Japan? There were, doubtless, Russian statesmen both in the East and at St. Petersburg who would readily have done this. But the responsible government of the empire, which is not made up of fools, could not, in our judgment, have done anything so insane and certain of failure. We therefore felt sure when the report came that there was some mistake about it.

Russia—we do not believe her to be yet any too saintly—undoubtedly would like to annex Manchuria, a valuable piece of territory, but undeveloped and loosely related to China, and she would take it over at once, probably to the great advantage of the country, if she were free to do so,—free, that is, from her connections with and obligations to others. But with all these upon her, the course outlined in the disturbing dispatch from Peking was impossible. It is curious, under the circumstances, that the report was so wholly and universally believed. But this is only another evidence of one of the deepest remaining weaknesses of our civilization—the readiness to believe everything bad of peoples as of individuals, and on the slightest ground to indulge in all sorts of international detraction and slander.

It turns out, fortunately, that all the more serious

phases of the Pekin report are false. They have been denied from St. Petersburg. The origin of the report seems to have been the wish of Russia, on withdrawing her troops, the stipulated time for which had arrived, to assure herself that Manchurian territory would not be alienated to other powers, and that certain sanitary measures should be carried out as a protection against the plague and other diseases. The move — what there was of it — seems to have been caused largely by fear of aggressions on the part of England and Japan, whose alliance Russia has always considered directed specifically against her. Russia, it is thought at this writing, will give renewed assurances to the United States and other governments that she has no intention of trying to shut up Manchuria against them as outlined in the report from Pekin.

The Reconstruction of Patriotism.

The article by John C. Havemeyer, reprinted from the New York *Evening Post* in our last issue, and the Memorial Day address by Rev. J. W. Kliever, published in this number, are instructive examples of the kind of thinking and utterance on the subject of patriotism which one meets with in these days with increasing frequency. The other day at the New England Methodist Conference held in Brookline, Mass., Rev. E. M. Taylor, D. D., New England Field Secretary of the Methodist Foreign Missionary Society, made use of the following remarkable language:

"In these days the world recognizes its organic unity as never before in its entire history. Nations are beginning to feel the sentiment of humanity stronger than the sentiment of patriotism. The day is on the march when the people of a federated world will look upon even the pure patriotism of a Washington or a Lincoln as provincial and in a sense narrow, in comparison with the broader view that looks upon the great nations as one brotherhood."

This utterance of Dr. Taylor comes out of the real heart of the time. It is a fine interpretation of that living and impelling spirit back of the heaving breast of our present social condition, which is to give the next great victory of civilization. It is perfectly clear to all attentive observers that the days of patriotism of the type believed in and practiced for many centuries are soon to be numbered. Modern intelligence and Christian conscience, modern notions of the brotherhood of men, the modern sense of the unity of the nations and their community of interests, make increasingly intolerable the grossly selfish, barbarous and inhuman thing which has passed heretofore so prevalently under the name of patriotism, but which in reality was not patriotism at all.

Tolstoy insists that patriotism must be entirely destroyed, as essentially and totally wicked. The forbearing consideration, if not pleasure, with which his statements are received by even the loud "patriots"

themselves, is evidence enough of the changed animus of the time. If the old patriotism had not already largely lost its hold upon the hearts of men, the Russian Count would long ago have been spirited away, farther than to Siberia. What Tolstoy says of patriotism is probably all true in the sense in which he means it. But before his sweeping declaration is accepted in its absolute sense, we must insist on having from him a clear definition of that which is to be destroyed. Few people will ever concede that country is not to be loved in any sense.

Mr. Havemeyer, in his propositions quoted in our April issue, goes to the same lengths of statement as Tolstoy, until he comes to his last declaration. Here he concedes that there is a true patriotism, though radically different from that which he condemns. "The true patriot," he says, "interprets 'love of country' to signify love for the people who are in it. He will express this feeling by a special interest in their welfare and effort to make them the purest, noblest and happiest among the nations of the earth. This love will necessarily expand into a world-wide love, for all men have a common origin, need, nature and destiny."

This proposition not only asserts the fact of a legitimate patriotism, but also indicates its nature. The statement might justly have gone farther. The true patriot will not only love the *people* of his country and promote in all practicable ways their essential welfare; he will also love and appreciate and seek to further perfect the *institutions* of the country, so far as these are good and adapted to the real interests of the people. It is hardly correct to say that this love of country will expand into a world-wide love. Love of country is not swallowed up, does not disappear, is not even merged in love of humanity. The two are coördinate, and exist and grow side by side, just as love of one's family and love of one's country do. They react upon each other. Love of humanity does more for love of country than the latter for the former. It clarifies it, enlarges its vision, purges it of selfishness, corrects its temper, deepens and intensifies all that is right in it. One who does not love humanity can never be a genuine patriot. One who does, is certain to be.

In the reconstruction of patriotism which the better spirit of our time is producing, several things are to take place. All hate and contempt, all jealousy and disparagement of other peoples will disappear out of it. All desire to fight against and injure them will be eradicated. All boastfulness and swagger and vainglory about one's own country will fall away. All desire to promote the prosperity and welfare of one's own people at the expense or neglect of other peoples will be eliminated. All disposition to support one's country in wrong, to condone its manifest iniquities and to blindly ignore its imperfections will be put away.